Application no. 10/067.463

July 6, 2005

Commissioner of Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Attn:

Art Unit 2612 - Examiner Jerabek, Kelly L

FROM:

George O. Saile, Reg. No. 19,572

28 Davis Avenue

Poughkeepsie, N.Y. 12603

SUBJECT:

Serial #:

10/067,463

File Date:

02/04/2002

Inventor:

Vahid Orboubadian

Examiner: Art Unit:

Jerabek, Kelly L

Title:

Methods and Systems for Embedding Camera Information in

Images

## RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Dear Sir:

This is in response to the Restriction Requirement in the Office Action dated June 6, 2005. In that office action, restriction was required to one of the following Inventions under

## CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on July 6, 2005.

> Signature<sub>(</sub> Stephen B. Ackerman, Reg. No. 37,761

Date: July 6, 2005

## 35 U.S.C. 121:

The inventions stated are:

I - Claims 1-16 and 26, drawn to a method of embedding a watermark in an image, classified in class 348, subclass 231.3, and

II - Claims 17-25, drawn to a method of enhancing an image using information from a watermark in an image, classified in class 382, subclass 254.

Applicant provisionally elects to be examined the Invention described by the Examiner as Group I - Claims 1-16 and 26, drawn to a process classified in Class 348, subclass 231.3. This election is made with traverse of the requirement under 37 C.F.R. 1.143 for the reasons given in the following paragraphs.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the Requirement for Restriction in the Office Action.

The Examiner states that Inventions I and II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination, and gives as the reasons for distinctness that the subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. However, upon reading the Invention II Claims against the Claims of Invention I, it can be seen that Invention II is drawn to "a method of extracting camera-

Application no. 10/067.463

DYM02-009

related information", while Invention I is drawn to "a method of embedding camera information". As such, the field of search must necessarily cover both the Group I class/subclass 348/231.3 and the Group II class/subclass 382/254, in addition to other related Classes and subclasses to provide a complete and adequate search. The fields of search for the Group I and Group II inventions are clearly and necessarily co-extensive. The Examiner's suggestion that "invention I has separate utility such as embedding a watermark in an image in order to record the time of image capture" is speculative and has nothing to do with the Claims as presented in this patent application.

Further, it is respectfully suggested that these reasons are insufficient to place the additional cost of additional Patent Applications upon the Applicants. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw this restriction requirement for these reasons.

Withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement, and allowance of the present Patent Application, is respectfully requested.

It is requested that should there be any problems with this response, please call the undersigned Attorney at (845) 452-5863.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen B. Ackerman, Reg. No, 37,761